



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)  
Dkt May-05

HULSEY IP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAWYERS, P.C.  
1250 SOUTH CAPITAL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY  
BUILDING THREE, SUITE 610  
AUSTIN, TX 78746

**COPY MAILED**

**MAY 23 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Delbert Tesar : DECISION ON PETITION  
Application No. 10/714,183 :  
Filed: 14 November, 2003 :  
Atty Docket No. 126928-1000 :

This is a decision on the petition filed on 13 May, 2005  
(certificate of mailing date 9 May, 2005), under 37 CFR 1.137(a)<sup>1</sup>  
to revive the above-identified application which is first treated  
as a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

The petition is dismissed.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be  
submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this  
decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are  
permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover  
letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)" or

---

<sup>1</sup> A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed; In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(l);

(3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

"Renewed Petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment," or as discussed below "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)."

The application became abandoned on 13 October, 2004, for failure to timely file a response to the non-final Office action mailed on 12 July, 2004, which set a three (3) month shortened period for reply. No extensions of the time for reply in accordance with 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Petitioner attempted to file a timely amendment with an extension of time on 18 January, 2005 (certificate of mailing date 12 January, 2005), but the extension of time fee was insufficient. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 22 February, 2005.

Petitioner asserts that the amendment filed on 18 January, 2005, was timely and included a proper three (3) month extension of time.

#### **PETITION TO WITHDRAW THE HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT**

Petitioner asserts that a proper reply to the non-final Office action mailed on 12 July, 2004, including a three (3) month extension of time, was properly filed on 18 January, 2005. Petitioners state that a copy of the credit card authorization form is included with the petition.

A review of the papers included with the present petition reveals that no copy of a credit card form is enclosed. A review of Office financial records, however, reveals that the Credit Card Payment Form filed by petitioner on 18 January, 2005, authorized the Office to charge counsel's credit card for \$490.00, not \$510.00.

The Office notes that the extension of time fee was charged in the amount due effective 1 October, 2004, through 8 December, 2004 (i.e., \$490.00). On 8 December, 2004, however, the small entity fee for a three (3) month extension of time was increased to \$510.00. As 37 CFR 1.23(b) requires that the amount of a fee paid by credit card must be specified, and that a general authorization to charge fees is not acceptable.

37 CFR 1.23 states, in pertinent part:

(b) Payments of money required for United States Patent and Trademark Office fees may also be made by credit card. Payment of a fee by credit card must specify the amount to be charged to the credit card and such other information as is necessary to process the charge, and

is subject to collection of the fee. The Office will not accept a general authorization to charge fees to a credit card. If credit card information is provided on a form or document other than a form provided by the Office for the payment of fees by credit card, the Office will not be liable if the credit card number becomes public knowledge.

As such, the showing of record is that petitioner inadvertently provided the wrong amount to be charged for the extension of time fee. As such, this constitutes an error on the part of petitioner rather than the USPTO, and, since the extension of time fee was not paid in the proper amount, the holding of abandonment will not be withdrawn.

**PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(a)**

The Commissioner may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to be "unavoidable".<sup>2</sup> Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>35 U.S.C. § 133.

<sup>3</sup>In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally,

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).<sup>4</sup> Specifically, an application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office.<sup>5</sup>

As stated above, the showing of record is that petitioner submitted a credit card payment which was not in the correct amount. As stated above, credit card payments to the Office must specify the exact amount to be charged, and a general authorization to charge all fees to a credit card will not be accepted.

A delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay.<sup>6</sup> A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (1) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from Office employees; or (2) the Office's failure to advise the applicant of any deficiency in sufficient time to permit the applicant to take corrective action.<sup>7</sup>

---

a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

<sup>4</sup> See MPEP 711(c) (III) (C) (2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay.

<sup>5</sup> Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887).

<sup>6</sup> See Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987), Vincent v. Mossinghoff, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891).

<sup>7</sup> See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985); see also In re Colombo, Inc., 33 USPQ2d 1530, 1532 (Comm'r Pat. 1994) (while the Office attempts to notify applicants of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction, the Office has no obligation to notify parties of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction).

As such, petitioner did not file a timely amendment and extension of time. The showing of record does not rise to the level of unavoidable delay, and the petition will therefore be dismissed.

#### **ALTERNATIVE VENUE**

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), which now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after 8 June, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

A copy of the form for filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive an application unintentionally abandoned is enclosed herewith for petitioner's convenience.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136, an extension of time must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum period obtainable for reply to avoid abandonment. Accordingly, since the extension of time fees submitted with the present petition were filed subsequent to the maximum period obtainable for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be refunded by Treasury Check.

The duplicate petition fee and extension of time fees submitted with the petition will be refunded by Treasury Check.

Receipt of the revocation and new power of attorney is acknowledged. All correspondence will be sent to the new address of record.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (703)872-9306  
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window  
Mail Stop Petition  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571)272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood  
Senior Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Form PTO/SB/64  
Privacy Act Statement  
Notice Regarding Change of Power of Attorney  
Notice of Acceptance of Power of Attorney